CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
COMMERCE AND ADMINISTRATION FACULTY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1985

In Attendance: S. H. Appelbaum (Chairman)

M. Abbass (CGSA), M. Anvari (Q.M.), K. Argheyd (Mana.), M. Armstrong, (Econ.), V. V. Baba (Mana.), B. Barbieri (Assoc. Dean), L. Bessner (Acco.), J. D. Blazouske (Acco.), J. P. Brunet (Mana.), M. Coulas (CASA), R. Curnew (Acco.) I. Devine (Mana.), D. Diniacopoulos (Comm. Studies), D. Doreen (Q.M.), C. Draimin (Assoc. Dean), D. Gandhi (Fina.), Z. Gidengil (Mktg.), J. R. Goodwin (Mana.), P. Goyal (Comp. Sci.), S. Goyal (Q.M.), A. Jalilvand (Fina.), J. Kelly (Mana.), V. H. Kirpalani (Mktg.), M. Kusy (Q.M.), J. Mahaffy (AIESEC), L. McGown (Mktg.), R. McTavish (Mktg.), C. Potter (Fina.), C.A. Ross (Assoc. Dean), J. Ryu (CGSA), P. Sidler (ASC), B. Smart (Reg.) N. Trocchia, (ASC), M. Valois (student), F. R. Whyte (Vice Rector, Academic), R. O. Wills (Assoc. Dean)

Absent with regrets: S. Alvi

I Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 09:40.

II Open Meeting

III Approval of Agenda (CAFC-85-10A)

IT WAS MOVED BY V. V. BABA AND SECONDED BY Z. GIDENGIL THAT THE AGENDA (CAFC-85-10A) BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED

IV Business Arising from Previous Meeting (CAFC-85-09M)

1. Restructuring of Senate and Standing Committees of Senate

The Chairman welcomed Vice Rector, Academic, Dr. F. R. Whyte, who responded on behalf of the Rector to the request of the Commerce and Administration Faculty Council to attend this special meeting to address the concerns of the faculty with respect to the proposed revisions to the membership and powers of Senate.

The Secretary of the Faculty Council Steering Committee, V. V. Baba, read the motions related to the restructuring of Senate which had been accepted at the October 25th, 1985 Council meeting as well as the Notice of Motion CAFC-85-11A-01.

Restructuring of Senate and Standing Committees of Senate (cont'd.)

Dr. Whyte noted that the proposal addresses two issues, the membership of Senate and the effective functioning of the Standing Committees of Senate. With respect to membership, he advised that the Steering Committee of Senate attempted to present a balanced proposal which would reduce the unwieldy size of Senate while providing equitable faculty representation. With respect to the Standing Committees of Senate, he stated that the Steering Committee found it advisable that committee members have the opportunity to participate more actively in committee work thereby ensuring better preparation of material to be presented at Senate and consequently, more positive and enlightened debate on the floor of Senate. He noted that provision for technical and administrative expertise on the Senate Standing Committees would allow technical versus policy questions to be debated at the committee level rather than on the floor of Senate. He emphasized the importance of the roles of the Academic Planning Committee and the Research Committee that will give long overdue consideration to the long term development of the University.

Dr. Whyte invited questions from the floor.

In response to B. Barbieri's request for clarification of the roles of the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Programmes Committee, Dr. Whyte explained that although there was a certain degree of overlap between the committees, the Academic Planning Committee deals with long term issues as opposed to day to day issues which are to be handled by the Academic Programme Committee. The Academic Planning Committee will be the coordinating body providing policy advice to Senate.

P. Brunet stated that the restructuring of Senate is being perceived as a move towards centralizing power with the administration leaving faculty with less influence on university issues. Dr. Whyte replied that this is a normal reaction structural change and although the reaction is understandable he does not feel that the proposed restructuring will lead to a major shift in power. The committee structure provides for balance whereby the technocrats are the same people who were involved up until now with the opportunity of increased participation. He added that Senate Committees will be composed of well informed members with the same global vision as Senate resulting in clarification of material presented to Senate.

P. Brunet questioned the decision making role of the Senate Steering Committee. Dr. Whyte confirmed that the Steering Committee does take a directive role for the purpose of ensuring that when issues are presented to Senate, all background work has been thoroughly done thus allowing effective

Restructuring of Senate and Standing Committees of Senate (cont'd.)

use of Senate discussion.

V.V. Baba questioned the rationale for the existing proportion of Senate representatives and asked how a 10% reduction would make Senate "less unwieldy". Dr. Whyte replied that the proportions were not analysed in terms of percentages but rather to achieve equity in the number of representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Science and the other faculties.

M. Kusy expressed his concern with the greater power of the Senate Steering Committee indicating the potential for abuse under a malevolent leadership. He noted that with the authority to block documentation from presentation at Senate, there is a possiblity of Senate and the Board of Governors becoming a rubber stamp process. Dr. Whyte agreed that technically, blocking would be possible, but in reality, the Steering Committee can not hold back but must look at the process, ensure work is well done and the documents are well prepared.

M. Coulas asked for a comment on the reduction of undergraduate student representation from 17 to 10. Dr. Whyte explained that proportional representation of faculty was the main concern. The Steering Committee addressed this in the context of reducing the number of representatives resulting in the students absorbing the reduction. He added that the students have made their views clear and it is possible that Senate may decide that the size is not a critical issue.

In response to V. H. Kirpalani's request for comment on the role of the Academic Planning Committee, Dr. Whyte advised that planning is one of the major problems which must be addressed over the next three years. Resources and programme approvals at the provincial level will be established on the long range development plans. Senate plays a key role in this process, not in doing the planning but in initiating, coordinating, studying and making recommendations through faculties.

J. Kelly compared the restructuring of Senate to the rearrangement of deck chairs on the Titanic and stated that the faculty was awstruck by the cartesian simplicity of this proposal. He attributed the University's past success to the decentralized mode of operation and pointed out that an enormous sense of disquiet exists as result of what is perceived as a direct challenge to how business had been conducted in the past. He noted that there has been no initiative for change from the faculty and stated that endorsement of such changes requires a referendum procedure to avoid a constitutional crisis.

Restructuring of Senate and Standing Committees of Senate (cont'd.)

Dr. Whyte replied that when an institution faces chronic financial difficulties, short-term thinking becomes a habit. The Academic Planning Committee will attempt to break this habit with a view to the long term development of the University in which Senate plays a vital role. He agreed that there was an element of cartesian simplicity in what started off to be a structural question but became a substantive question. He added that although he was not partial to structural solutions, he believed there many benefits to the proposal.

C. Potter stated that the restructuring of Senate as proposed is the first step towards dismanteling the collegial nature of the present structure. Dr. Whyte indicated that the Committees ensure the continuance of the collegial nature of the University.

M. Armstrong pointed out that it was highly possible, with the Senator's increased workload, that the most dynamic contributors would be eliminated. Dr. Whyte agreed that the workload of the Academic Planning Committee was heavy but the other committees had lighter loads and noted that collegial administration demands a great deal of time.

M. Kusy stated that this debate was symptomatic of a greater malaise, specifically, concern for the direction of the University, the financial exigencies and the mangement style.

With respect to the budget situation, Dr. Whyte advised that in an attempt to avoid simplistic solutions, it was necessary to step back to get a clear picture of the University budget and to determine the kind of controls needed. The process was very time consuming which caused considerable anxiety. He stated that the 1985-86 budget along with a forecast for 1986-87 will be presented to the Board of Governors next Tuesday, November 19th. He indicated that support for increased government funding will come from our fellow institutions and a preliminary report of a funding study carried out by the Conseil des Universitaires puts Concoria's case in a favorable light. He added that Concordia will be featured in this weekend's Montreal Gazette.

L. McGown asked what would be done if the government demanded a balanced budget. Dr. Whyte replied that the University would be downsized.

R. Wills asked how curriculum matters will be dealt with by the Academic Programmes Committee in light of the potential lack of expertise of the Senators on the committee. Dr. Whyte

replied that he did not see any difficulty in that the committee has essentially the same mandate as UUUC and will receive input from UUUC on technical matters.

The Chairman commented that he had difficulty conceptualizing the government cutting educational institutions to the marrow after having given Hyundai $100M.

The Chairman stated that a universal model was preferable to the proposed machine-like structure and asked what the Steering Committee will do now that the faculty has expressed objection to the proposal. Dr. Whyte replied that after feedback from all faculties has been analysed, the committee will formulate another proposal for consideration.

In conclusion, Dr. Whyte advised the Council that a letter to the government will be drafted at the forthcoming budget meeting.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Whyte for an interesting debate.

V Other Business

A discussion concerning the notice of motion, CAFC-85-11A-01, ensued. It was agreed that this issue be dealt with as scheduled at the November 22nd meeting of Faculty Council.

IT WAS MOVED BY P. BRUNET AND SECONDED BY M. KUSY THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

VI Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of Faculty Council will take place on Friday, November 22, 1985 at 09:30 in room GM503-48, Sir George Williams Campus.